

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

May 9, 2006

5:30 PM

Vice-Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function led by Alderman O'Neil.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Gatsas, Long, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Thibault and Forest

Absent: Aldermen Duval and DeVries

Messrs.: Joan Porter, Diane Prew, Jennie Angell, Leon LaFreniere, Tom Clark, Virginia Lamberton, Fred Rusczek, David Cornell, Tom Nichols, Stephan Hamilton, Robert MacKenzie, Denise van Zanten, Mayor Guinta, Leo Bernier, Carol Johnson, Tricia Piecuch, Ron Robidas

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated we are in the second phase of our budget process here we've moved to a different color of paper, and we are on the yellow sheets, so we will attempt to get through these quickly these are the numbers that we had talked to the department heads as they came in we can query them very quickly because we are on a tight time frame of every 20 minutes so I would hope that the Board if they need additional questions from where we are that they can get to them on their own on the outside because we will have one more final round before we look to start voting on some of these individual departments as they come forward.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas addressed the **Office of the Tax Collector**.

Tax Collector Joan Porter addressed the Committee stating thank you for the opportunity to once again address the budget for the Tax Collector's office. I did want to explain that the number given to us at the last presentation was 763,448 with the intention of eliminating one part time position. However, with the recalculated benefits, it would be necessary to change that amount to 766,812 if

we intend to maintain that intent. I hope that was clear in my report. I have submitted possibilities for increased revenues to issue new plates in our office would be a welcome addition to the taxpayer and well worth the fee of \$2.50 they would pay to save the trip to Canal Street. Currently given the opportunity, most customers pay us the extra \$2.50 to obtain their decals in our office, instead of going to DMV. If they could now pay us the extra \$2.50 to obtain new plates they would be quite pleased since they have been requesting this for quite awhile. Councilor Wieczorek has offered to assist in this endeavor. There is another issue I would like to address with you tonight, I'd like to encourage more mortgage companies and banks to send us a payment file which would then update our data base electronically. Currently there are six entities that do this. They pay us \$500 per billing or a thousand dollars a year. However, I would like to eliminate that fee and offer the file to any bank or mortgage company who has the capability of producing this file but who is currently not willing to pay the fee. This would reduce the number of transactions processed manually and our files would be updated electronically. In the past two years approximately 20,000 parcels per year were processed electronically at no cost to the city by just these six entities. In comparison approximately 28,500 per year were done manually through lock box at a cost of about 7 cents a transaction. If we can do more electronically we can reduce the amount of transactions that we pay for and advance to that paperless future sooner rather than later. I would need your permission to discontinue charging the \$500 fee for this file. Obviously I would prefer to be fully staffed. However, as I have stated in the past and in my recent communication to you we can function with the elimination of the part time position, which would become vacant under the current recommendation. It will mean that we will have a shortage at the counter in the afternoon. Most days that would probably not be critical assuming good health of our current employees but there will be busy days when that vacancy will be felt either in the processing of mail or service at the counter. I remind you that we collect close to 200 million, we register 117,000 cars, and the cost to the taxpayer of our entire operation is less than 2 ½ to 4 cents on the rate depending on which tax base and which rate you use. It equates to less than half a penny for every dollar we collect. We've worked hard at efficiencies and we continue to look for ways to do our jobs, which are beneficial to both the taxpayer and the customer, who often are one and the same person. On that note no man or woman is an island. The Tax Collector office staff is one of which I am very proud. Our retention numbers speak for themselves. I also want to reiterate that without the staff at Info Systems we wouldn't have some of these efficiencies. You recently read about busy signals at DMV, the phone system purchased by Info Systems has made it possible for us to have direct access to employees by extension numbers, we have voice mail, our frequently asked questions are answered in the greeting when you call our office and that causes most callers to hang up as their question has been answered, and it has a myriad of other options for us. In addition the on line inquiry for real estate

taxes has been phenomenal in reducing the number of phone calls. This was a collaborative effort between Info and HTE. Together these two efficiencies alone resulted in us being able to eliminate one position when it became vacant and we spread the remaining duties among other staff. Our motor vehicle program was written in house and is exemplary and is built in efficiencies. We had hoped to have an interface to the new state motor vehicle program, which would preserve our efficiencies and bypass some of the problems encountered by other municipalities who are on the system now. However, without sufficient programming staff it will not be possible to even consider an in house interface. If the budget that the Mayor has given us is approved we will definitely be looking at the reduction of staff of two full time employees. There is no way around that. And this will be critical. This is not a scare tactic. Look at our line items. Our two highest expenses are both necessary expenses postage and professional services for title searches, for which we are predominately reimbursed by the customer and together they don't add up to one full time employee with benefits. A cut in salary is my only option, unless you see fit to restore those funds from the salary adjustment account. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Joan let me see if understood what you said. You can live with the 766,812 but that would be eliminating the part time employee and that would be felt on days of opening postage or things like but you could make due with that.

Ms. Porter replied yes.

Alderman Osborne asked what percentage does this come under for level budgeting, if you had level budgeting in your department.

Ms. Porter replied I'm not sure I understand the question.

Alderman Osborne asked what percentage, what decrease is this your budget, the mayor's or.

Ms. Porter stated the Mayor's budget, it ended up being with the new benefit numbers it ended up being a 100,304 from our original request.

Alderman Osborne stated he was just trying to get the percentage.

Ms. Porter replied about 9%.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated a 9% increase from where the Mayor was.

Ms. Porter replied right.

Alderman Osborne stated okay you say you would loose two full time employees.

Ms. Porter replied if the Mayor's original budget were passed we would loose two full time employees.

Alderman Osborne asked what percentage that would be at.

Ms. Porter replied I thought that was what we just answered.

Alderman Osborne asked are you talking about the Mayor or the yellow sheet.

Ms. Porter replied I'm confused.

Alderman Osborne stated alright, in other words if you say you are going to get a 3% cut, what would this be.

Ms. Porter replied the 3% cut was going to be 52,295, from our original request.

Alderman Osborne replied okay, thank you.

Alderman Roy stated to Ms. Porter, the two revenue sources, the first one you start off with in your paragraph one, this is a long shot. Define long shot for us.

Ms. Porter replied we had asked, I think I explained this to you, we had asked state motor vehicles a while ago if we could start issuing plates because that was part of the natural progression. However, at the point that we asked state motor vehicles was beginning or they thought they were beginning to roll out their new motor vehicle program and they ultimately decided that they were not going to add any new work to what is being sent up to motor vehicles to be keyed manually while they are trying to roll out a new program. So if we ended up doing this then State motor vehicles right now accepts our work and manually keys it into a system up in Concord, and because of that manual keying from many communities they are behind on the keying and so they prefer not to do that. Our desire to do that was based on a desire to give the customers in Manchester what they are looking for and continue the efficiencies we have. We have chosen not to go on the new motor vehicle program yet because there are still bugs in the system and it from what we have heard and we are planning to go and observe, but what we are

hearing is that it has slowed the process down considerably and we don't want to get on to it until we know we can keep up with the efficiency in time that we have. So the issuing new plates I understand the state's side and I understand where we are coming from.

Alderman Roy stated so if we needed to enact this the \$50,000 could be counted on when, if you had to estimate out a time.

Ms. Porter replied as soon as they allow.

Alderman Roy said so July 1, September 1?

Ms. Porter replied July 1 would work.

Alderman Roy stated and the 110,000 revenue we could vote prior to July 1 and enact that again on July 1st.

Ms. Porter replied yes.

Alderman Smith stated Joan, apparently you can live with the aldermen's intent, 766,812, I was wondering because I just registered my car and I had quite a wait, and it was inconvenient to me, but I should have registered it early, but I noticed at 5:00 you have quite a bit of people coming in at 4:30 how would that, would it involve overtime on your part to get those people in line to register their cars.

Ms. Porter replied most of the time the afternoon is not a serious problem we have three people that stay until 5:15 so those three are there working on the counter right up until 5:00 and cash out after. They come in at 8:15 and work till 5:15 so it's not an overtime situation.

Alderman Lopez asked Joan, with that I come up with 17,047,400 if you do the 110,000 plus the 50,000 as revenue.

Ms. Porter replied yes.

There were no further questions, and Vice-Chairman Gatsas thanked Ms. Porter.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **Information Systems**

Diane Prew, Director of Information Systems addressed the Committee stating thank you for the opportunity to address our budget once more. The numbers that we have provided to you reflect corrections in the benefit numbers from last time. The budget that we are presenting is a little bit more than 1% less than our 2006 budget. It reflects the loss of two staff positions, the vacant programmer position and the administrative assistant retiring in November. It allows sufficient funds to cover our fixed costs, which amount to almost 86% of the line item budget. These

include things such as the mail service for tax bills, service agreements for maintaining our software licenses and our hardware maintenance, the city's internet connectivity, postage, and printing of the forms necessary for tax billing and motor vehicle. It also has allowed us to add some funds to staff development so we can keep our staff current with technology and keep them certified to do the kinds of maintenance and such that is needed. It also allows us to fund some in data processing we are looking for some security software for our mainframe system and some automated management software for our servers to improve our efficiency. There is a little bit of money for unscheduled software and that's for things like the VISTA program that's coming on board that requires the volunteers to have computers set up, we will probably be able to find some of those systems within the departments but others will have to be purchased new. Under this budget we have minimal maintenance and repair monies. This will work for us if the technology reserve funds are available for the IT upgrade and replacement plan for FY2007. Last year we received 250,000 dollars for this, it's my understanding that \$250,000 is being considered for this year. So that would be very important for us to be able to function with this budget. On the revenue side I have passed out a sheet to you, I'm afraid that our revenues were somewhat overstated, and the numbers that we are presenting we feel are a little bit more realistic. We do not generate revenues on the outside, our revenues are reimbursements that we receive from the enterprise funds primarily from the water and EPD departments. We do some for school and airport and parks and recreation, but the rest of the data that resides on our systems is managed by other departments and they are the ones that distribute and collect funds on the sale of that data.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the five positions that were eliminated in the Mayor's budget can you give me what those total please, each position.

Ms. Prew replied the Administrative Assistant position you want it including benefits?

Vice Chair Gatsas replied without benefits.

Ms. Prew continued stating the regular wages were 36,198.40. The vacant programmer position was 39,582.40. The Web Administrator position is 55,027.20. The LAN Administrator position was 68,457.60.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the LAN Administrator position is currently vacant.

Ms. Prew replied no, that position is filled. There was a micro-support specialist is 62,545.60. Let me correct that 56,020, and that's for a micro-support specialist.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked out of those five positions are there any vacant currently.

Ms. Prew stated currently the computer programmer position is vacant and the administrative assistant is leaving in November.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and the yellow sheet response, did you eliminate any position.

Ms. Prew stated I eliminated those two positions, the computer programmer and the administrative assistant.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that would be the 39,582, and the 55,027.

Ms. Prew replied 36,198 for the administrative assistant and 39,582 for the programmer.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the LAN Administrator, normally in most IT functions the director and the LAN Administrator are one in the same.

Ms. Prew replied no they are not. Not in the departments that we have been speaking to.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked who have you spoken to.

Ms. Prew stated there is a form that was passed out to you that lists the various communities that we have spoken to.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked if she could show her which community has the LAN person.

Ms. Angell stated I can give you a little background on that. On Cambridge, they have a network of one network administrator. Lowell whose not on here because I was having trouble trying to match them up they don't have a network administrator, but in the last year they have spent \$154,000 outsourcing the functions. Waterbury, CT., has a director, they also have a network engineer. Stanford, CT. has a network administrator. Nashua has a network administrator.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and Nashua has 8 less employees so they must be some differentiation in there, they may have a LAN administrator but there are 8 less employees.

Ms. Angell replied Nashua also has 400 few PC's and 30 fewer buildings.

Ms. Prew stated they also outsource some of its maintenance.

Ms. Angell stated they do some outsourcing.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what is their total cost in their department.

Ms. Angell replied I don't have their budget here.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked if she had somebody else's budget there.

Ms. Prew stated we could provide you with some of that information later this week.

Alderman Osborne stated the mayor's budget, how many bodies would you be loosing.

Ms. Prew replied five.

Alderman Osborne stated okay, and this yellow sheet you would be loosing what.

Ms. Prew replied two.

Alderman Roy stated Diane, your yellow sheet response you did not include the two vacant positions but you included the three employees that you'd like to keep.

Ms. Prew stated that was correct.

Alderman Roy stated one of the positions, the 36,198 position that is currently vacant, how long has it been vacant.

Ms. Prew replied since September.

Alderman Roy stated and that position's title.

Ms. Prew replied computer programmer.

Alderman Roy stated and you feel that those duties could be picked up by current staff.

Ms. Prew stated we can deal with that yes.

Alderman Roy stated and the second position is a retiring position.

Ms. Prew replied yes.

Alderman Roy stated and that's 39,582.

Ms. Prew replied right.

Alderman Roy asked the date of the retirement.

Ms. Prew replied November, before Thanksgiving.

Alderman Roy asked how long the employee had been with the department.

Ms. Prew replied almost nine years, and she worked at the parks department, between the two departments it's been over nine years.

Alderman Roy and stated that was a scheduled retirement prior to budget season.

Ms. Prew replied yes.

Alderman Roy stated and your existing employees can pick up the job that employee has been doing.

Ms. Prew replied we will, we will spread the duties best we can.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated what I have done is taken the Mayor's budget, I've added in the three positions that you are looking for, added that to a salary line, that came out to 2,030,336.

Ms. Prew stated the response to that just looking at the number without in detail is that I'm afraid we will not be able to cover our service contracts, that's the 417,000 those are the licenses that we pay for HTE those are the maintenance contracts we have on the equipment those are the subscription fees we pay for some software. All of that's under contract.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated my suggestion is you look through your budget and if that means you have to eliminate another person I would suggest you look at it because times are tough.

Alderman Roy stated I may be wrong but I am coming up with a different number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated well I took the Mayor's 1,844,307. I added to that number 55,027 and 68,457 and 62,445.

Alderman Roy stated I think that last number was changed by the department head to 56,020.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas said so you want to cut them another 6.

Ms. Prew stated no.

Alderman Roy stated okay so you are taking 62,545.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas said correct, which is 2,030,245.

Alderman Lopez stated that is with no benefits right.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas said I just touched salary.

Ms. Prew stated so we need to absorb the benefits also on this.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas said I think you need to absorb whatever you need to do, as I said to you.

Ms. Prew stated yes, but I think I just heard a different number, the number again is 2,030,336.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that's the number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **Building**

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated now Leon, what I'm looking at here is the Mayor's proposed, the department request, did you end up leaving here with a number from us.

Mr. LaFreniere replied I did not.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated okay, you can leave with one today. I apologize if I missed you.

Mr. LaFreniere stated thank you for the opportunity to come before you again and say when we last met I didn't find that there was a number the department was provided so we tried to respond to that by pointing out the fact that when we developed the budget every attempt was made to try to incorporate the potential savings as well as looking at potential revenue enhancement opportunities. This was done in recognition of the current budget conditions of the city as well as the mayor's directive to provide a budget request that was the minimum funding level necessary to maintaining his services, so we feel that we have done that within the context of our request, if the amended does beyond our initial request provides an opportunity an increase slightly over what we had come into the mayor with initially, and it will permit us to continue to provide our critical safety services to Manchester citizens while providing a positive impact on the tax rate. That's where we are at and we are ready to respond to any questions.

Alderman Osborne stated, the Mayor's budget how many bodies do you loose if any and the yellow sheet.

Mr. LaFreniere stated the yellow sheet number is the Mayor's number as well as the department request, the department request would not have us loose any positions and the Mayor's number which was under the scenario submitted during our earlier visit, scenario #3, was 1.2 inspector positions. That's under the mayor's budget and that's recognizing that the salary adjustment account funds may not be available to offset the budget reduction if they are available to cover the salary shortfall of \$58,000 then obviously would negate some of the impacts of that cut.

Alderman Smith stated I'm looking at this and apparently you can live with this proposal, but I am wondering are you going to be coming in I noticed the footnote down the bottom that you might be raising permit fees and so forth to make up the deficit.

Mr. LaFreniere stated yes we have a proposal that is going to be coming before you within the next couple of weeks to make adjustments to our existing fee schedule. We feel that that schedule as it is currently structured contains some opportunities to include some adjustments designed build a little more equity into the fee structure as well as to basically enhance our revenue position without compromising our competitive position with other communities. So yes, we are planning on coming on coming in with some adjustments to the fee schedule that we feel will bring in an extra \$200,000 that the Mayor has built into his budget.

Alderman Smith stated I noticed that you still have a vacant housing inspector position.

Mr. LaFreniere stated that is correct.

Alderman Smith asked if they would be appointing someone shortly.

That is our hope however, obviously we are very concerned about how the budget how the budget process unfolds and that is a consideration at this point as to if and when we make that appointment.

Alderman Smith stated what would be the amount of money for a Housing Inspector just coming into the City, what would be his rate.

Mr. LaFreniere replied it's just under \$40,000, 39,850 I believe.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I had asked you for some performance data, did you prepare that and bring it.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I did. What I have was the concern about is providing the information in a format that would be meaningful for the Board. I apologize I've left it at my seat (went to get it).

Mr. LaFreniere stated we actually ran some reports off the HTE system that I can share with the Committee I have brought summary sheets for those as well. But this single sheet is an attempt to put it in a meaningful form. Although the discussion at the time that we last met was primarily around the Housing Standards Division, I have included some comparable data for our structural division and if you go down through the columns essentially what we have done is provided some data regarding the number of dwelling units in the program the number of properties and the reason that there is a range is because the number of properties that come into and go out of the program depending upon eligibility and as requirements change over the course of a year, as well as the number of exempt

properties, the next section is inspection types where we have broken out the various types of inspections that are done by the individual inspectors and a total of the calendar years cases by type. I tried to break it out into a calendar year I thought it might be a little more meaningful for the Committee than doing it by the fiscal year. However I can regenerate that if the Committee feels it would be appropriate the other way.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas said so basically what you are showing us here is that the housing inspection or Certificates of Compliance, those inspectors are doing about one half the amount of work as the structural inspectors.

Mr. LaFreniere stated that's not accurate.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I don't mean half the amount of work, I mean half the amount of inspections, I apologize.

Mr. LaFreniere replied they are visiting half the number of sites, yes. There are several reasons for that, one is because the inspections that are done by the housing standards division to meet statutory requirements are all scheduled in advance and so what we do is we make a contact with the property owner, schedule the inspection, they make the arrangements with their various tenants to gain occupancy to the individual units and then we go out at a pre-prescribed time and while the range here is statistically it comes out to 4.34 site visits per day, that doesn't count for the fact that an individual site may be several apartments of many rooms, so the length of time that it takes on an individual site is certainly a very different procedure than on the structural side of the house. On the construction, I use the term structural and construction division interchangeably, those inspections are scheduled the day of the inspection, the electrician, the plumber, the builder calls up for his inspection on the day that he needs it, they go out and do their inspection they're usually of a much shorter duration and we can accommodate a much greater number of those in a given period of time.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated what I have done is I've deducted from your 1,588,356 the deduction is 50,000 in the salary line, brings you to 1,538,356, or actually I'm just going to deduct it from your bottom line and tell you to manage it as a manager would.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **City Solicitor/Risk/Auditor**

Tom Clark, City Solicitor, addressed the Committee stating since our last meeting here we took the number that the Finance Committee asked us to work with. We have reduced the workers comp line on the assumption that the workers comp reserve fund has been fully funded and available in the event it is needed. We took another look at our incidentals line we had originally requested 40,000, the Mayor's proposal was 20,000, we believe we can live with the 30,000 that we put in there so the number is actually 10,000 less than the number you gave us when we left here. We are here to answer any questions.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked about the actuarial service.

Solicitor Clark replied that's the annual actuarial service we have to have done on the general liability and the workers comp funds.

Mr. Ntapalis addressed the Committee stating statutorily we are required as a self insured entity, we set that standard amount aside each year to perform that actuarial study which we share with the Finance Department, it's a work in progress usually when you are looking at the annual budget.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I've deducted 10,000 from your bottom line and allowed you to go back, it leaves you 1,274,640.

Mayor Guinta stated I have a question. The numbers that you are providing the department heads, what number is that representing, when you say this is the number you are giving them.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied this is just a number that I've got on a yellow sheet of paper, obviously there is going to be many renditions of a budget. Other people have different numbers, I am trying to go as close to a number that the department has come forward with, with some sort of a request. Obviously I've looked at the incidental, the staff development I think that when we are in difficult times staff development is okay but that is something that is a want and not a need. But when I look at these numbers, the workers comp number is a number that is less than what you had in there, based on what we have seen for actuarially sound in budget line.

Mayor Guinta asked for the number just given.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied 1,274,640, which is about 78,000 less than your number.

Mayor Guinta thanked Vice-Chairman Gatsas for the clarification.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **Human Resources**

Ms. Virginia Lamberton addressed the Committee asking if they all had her yellow sheets. What I have done tonight is provide you with the numbers that when I was here last time you said to reduce certain lines and that's essentially what I have done is changed the salary line from the original projections to keep the City Negotiator and the Safety Manager and I had another position that was just vacated by a retirement and reduced that position by 15,000, you reduced the contributory retirement, contract manpower was the third bullet and those funds were in there to maintain security equipment that we've purchased throughout the City that their warranties have expired and we put it in there for lack of any other place to put it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated in your original proposal how much was your City contributory number that you reduced.

Ms. Lamberton replied the City contributory should have been 58,144.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated was or should be.

Ms. Lamberton replied should be.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated then let me understand what you have done here with these bullets. The bullet you have reinstated, in bullet one you have reinstated the Chief Negotiator and the security.

Ms. Lamberton replied correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and you have eliminated 15,000, so why don't you give me those numbers of what the Chief Negotiator the security person is.

Ms. Lamberton stated I believe the City Negotiator was 90,000, and the security manager was 74,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if I take those numbers and I plug them into the Mayor's cause I assume the Mayor has merely deducted those out of his recommended.

Ms. Lamberton replied well he deducted those and then some more money from there which essentially if you recall we had an administrative assistant I or II that just retired and about half of that position, it would have to be a part time position in order, in other words 2 ½ positions were eliminated by the Mayor's proposed budget.

Mayor Guinta replied that's not true. Two positions.

Ms. Lamberton stated but then you cut 4 percent or 4 ½ percent.

Mayor Guinta replied which is in the Salary Adjustment line item and I'll say it again, it's in the salary adjustment line item, which is going to be used to manage the vacancy and attrition rate. So I don't want to hear another department head say a number that they believe I am cutting is different than the number that I have told them, because quite frankly its not true. It will be a management decision whether that position would be filled. Two positions were removed in my proposal, security and the negotiator.

Alderman Lopez stated could you clarify that again, Your Honor, because there seems to be some discrepancy there, the Chief Negotiator and the Security Manager, and another person that retired. Are you saying you didn't eliminate that position.

Mayor Guinta stated no. What I am saying is if I think there is a tendency for department heads to look at the 06 salary line and 07 salary line and compare them. You can't because I've backed out the 4%, for salary adjustment, which there is no salary adjustment line item in the individual department, but it is on our summary sheet. What I am recommending is the elimination of the security and negotiator positions. I backed out 4% out the entire City salary line item, there was a 60 million line item, 4% is 2.4 million, 1.4 million is for tax relief the other million is in the salary adjustment, that's where at that point the department head would come to me and say I have a vacancy I need to fill it here is the reasoning why and through management of that vacancy and attrition I would say yes or no, at July 1st, August 1st or September 1st so we can manage that attrition number. I know there has been discussion about is the salary adjustment line funded to the point where we all feel comfortable as a Board, and if the Board has a position that they may want to increase the salary adjustment line to create greater flexibility I'd certainly be open to that but we would have to find where would that money come from. So I'm not saying I wouldn't fill the position but I'm not saying today that I would either I have to look at the entire scope of the vacancies in the city to determine what are the highest priorities and for me the first and foremost priority will be police.

Alderman Lopez stated just a follow up, so a department head when they are making their determinations they are looking at that position and subtracting that salary from that position in order to come up with a number for their department, but in turn they are not eliminating a position they can come back to you out of the salary line item.

Mayor Guinta stated correct.

Alderman Lopez stated that salary line adjustment is becoming a pretty big number.

Mayor Guinta stated well, we've got a million dollars to manage the attrition and the vacancy rate. That's why I say if the Board doesn't feel comfortable with that million dollars my suggestion would be to identify additional funds existing funds not chip away at the tax cut but find existing funds within the city budget to provide that flexibility that allows this Board a greater level of comfort that the positions that need to be filled would be filled within the twelve month fiscal year.

Alderman Lopez stated that it is pretty difficult for a department head to go on the basis that I'm going to get money out of there just in case and they have no position whatsoever.

Mayor Guinta stated I've been up front though what I have said is not everyone is going to get their position filled or they are not going to get it filled at the date that they'd like it filled, but that's managing the vacancy rate, that's managing the margin which is what I think we have to do in order to fully utilize the salary dollars that we available and also try to determine what salary line we should be at as a city in 12 months from now and beyond.

Alderman Lopez stated so if we eliminated the salary adjustment line period then positions will be gone.

Mayor Guinta stated if you eliminated the salary adjustment line.

Alderman Lopez replied yes, if the salary adjustment line was gone then the department head in this case would have no where to go but to eliminate that position.

Mayor Guinta stated if the salary adjustment line was reduced to 0 then what the department head is saying is correct she is then properly reflecting what she would have to do as a department head. Now, I am not advocating for getting rid of the salary adjustment line.

Ms. Lamberton stated I also have another issue with the non-departmental items that is on the bottom page employee medical services. Human Resources has the budget for all of the medicals that are done throughout the city and that includes random or alcohol and drug testing for our drivers that have commercial drivers licenses and that is a requirement by federal law that we do a certain percentage of those employees throughout the year. We also do random alcohol and drug testing for firefighters. All new employees have physicals, all new police officers and fire fighters are required by law to have physicals and they are very expensive because they are very comprehensive. In addition to that we are now required to give the fire fighters an annual physical examination, and that was a requirement that came through an organization called NIOSH. That was a consequence of a death of a fire fighter seven or eight years ago, and we were audited as to what we did right and what we did wrong, prior to that with the help of our fire fighters. We believed we had enough money in our medical account until the firefighters filed a grievance and they requested additional testing to be done and they prevailed in the grievance so now the physical exams that we have to do for them are much more expensive and much more comprehensive and so we will not have enough money next year if it's only budgeted at 100,000 to comply with the federal laws, the state laws, and the NIOSH requirements for medicals. And so attached to my yellow sheets a detailed listing of the different medical things that we are required to do. The only one being optional which is actually the least expensive is for all of our other employees that we hire we give them a physical prior to finalizing our offer for employment.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how many firemen do we have.

Ms. Lamberton replied I don't have that number.

Mayor Guinta replied 256 with a full complement.

Alderman O'Neil stated there is an number on here of 231.

Ms. Lamberton stated you have different levels, you have firefighters and you have Lt.'s.

Alderman O'Neil noted there were three line items that said 231, so there is 231 of three of the same tests being done for 231.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me understand, we spend \$100,000 for annual physicals for 231 people.

Ms. Lamberton replied no, may I answer Alderman O'Neil's question first. They are just the different types of tests that are being done during a physical exam, so it's the same 231 people taking different tests such as blood counts, it's just a complete detailed breakout of what goes on when they have the exam, to tell you what the numbers come from.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's try this again, 231 people receive annual physical, the cost of that is \$100,000.

Ms. Lamberton stated no, all of these different physicals on the last page is what costs over \$100,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated why don't you just go to your page and I'm reading across, I'm reading 231 annual physicals, the number that you have there is 100,023. If I divide that by 231 people that is annual physical of \$432 per person.

Ms. Lamberton stated that is quite likely by the time you get all the blood work done and what not.

Mayor Guinta asked does this go out to bid.

Ms. Lamberton replied yes.

Mayor Guinta stated when was the last time it went out to bid.

Ms. Lamberton replied it went out to bid I believe in 2002.

Mayor Guinta stated is it possible that if we went out to bid maybe we don't need the 200 and maybe we need the 100 and we probably should look at that rather than simply coming to this board and asking to replenish the money.

Ms. Lamberton stated we are currently paying rates that were established in 2002, so we are really ahead of the game right now as far as how much we are paying for this, however we will be putting the medicals out to bid in the fall.

Mayor Guinta stated a 430 physical is a competitive rate for a physical.

Ms. Lamberton stated I'm not the person that put this out to bid and requested Mr. Robidas to come forward and answer these questions.

Mr. Robidas stated the average that you are receiving is correct about \$432 per person is what it costs us for an annual physical for the firefighters.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I didn't think it was wrong.

Mr. Robidas stated no, but your numbers are correct. What happens is when we went out to bid in 2002 we went through a variety of medical providers and this was the low bid. What we are doing now is we are in the process, we actually have an active committee of reformatizing going out to bid again. We would have been able to extend the contract again with no increase in service to the City in pricing however since the arbitration decision it requires so many additional tests involved, we are in the process of putting a new bid spec together. So that bid spec will probably go out sometime this summer or this fall for additional medical services. We did receive two respondents last time to our bid when we put it out in 2002, and these were the best prices we had, plus in addition to the bid price we receive a 10% discount. There are extensive medical tests that are done and many of them are required by OSHA or National Fire Protection Association, they lay out what is required for the physicals. Prior to the arbitration decision, we were testing HAZMAT individuals, and that's why we weren't testing all individuals.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked who the winning bid was on this.

Mr. Robidas replied the Elliot Hospital, a subsidiary of the Elliot, it's the Elliot Regional Partners, it's part of the Elliot Hospital group.

Alderman O'Neil stated somehow if I count all of the sworn personnel, it's 229. That includes the Chief.

Mr. Robidas stated and the Chief is required to take the physical as well.

Alderman O'Neil stated so it's close to the 231. This is something in all honesty needs our attention because a lot of this comes out many of you have been here the wellness program that we approved we spent tens of thousands of dollars on equipment at every firehouse, and there has been issues with this whole physical and that's why it went to arbitration and we lost. Because unfortunately we weren't in a good position I know I've had some discussion with Alderman Lopez about asking the health officer or one of the two physicians on staff at the Health Department to take a look to see if we can approach this from a different way. This program is not working it's costing us all kinds of money and its not making for healthier firefighters, so I think it is something that needs some serious work and it is more than just awarding it to the low bidder because the low bidder hasn't been in our best interest in this particular program.

Mr. Robidas stated we are looking at the 231 annual physicals, now understanding that the 231 annual physicals are since arbitration decision which came out this past fall. Prior to then we were doing approximately I think off the top of my head about 120 firefighters annually, and those were Hazardous Material firefighters and that's because they were required to do it under the NFPA. So, once the arbitration decision came out and said that they all had to have annual physicals in conjunction with the wellness initiative program the numbers went up considerably that's why the cost increased. We added approximately 120 firefighters to the physical testing process that were not being done prior to then, again in conjunction with the wellness program and in conjunction with the arbitration decision, so prior to then you could almost look at the annual physicals and probably been reduced probably in the category of a half. So that's why when you see the cost previously it was about \$100,000 where it is now \$200,000 we've in essence doubled the pool...required on the arbitration decision the things that we were not doing previous and there's some discussion about the medical experts whether we were required to do them or not. Believe it or not the firefighter's union physician as well as the City's physician both testified some of these tests were not required medically to be done on every individual based upon a variety of factor, however, the arbitrator ruled that there was no discretion that we had to perform every single test that was indicated in the Wellness Program. So, there again there was some additional increasing costs and again it's applicable to every individual not just certain individuals so that's why the drastic increase in costs from previous times. I hope that clarified.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it certainly clarifies but when I start looking at some of these tests...a PSA test I didn't know was a requirement of being a firefighter. I understand what that's for.

Mr. Robidas stated it's not as a requirement for a firefighter...now, if you look at some of these like if you look at the PSA test and the Hep B tests the Measles and Mumps...things of that nature...that was in discussion that I had with the Fire Department and the administration of the Fire Department saying...calculating how many individuals they thought they would fall within these categories...a rough number of people that they thought would be required. Now, if you look at some of the Hep B series, etc. things like that that's based...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected now here's my question...

Mr. Robidas stated that was part of the arbitration case that we had to do it, we had to comply with everything that's in the decision and all the tests that are standardized. So, some of these people are based upon age and again in discussion

with the Fire administration how many people would fall in these categories they gave a rough number of probably 115 people would fall into that category.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated now let's try it again though. I would say that that's part of the medical plan. I would assume that when somebody walks into a doctor's office whether he's a firefighter or not after a certain age somebody's going to say to you as part of your physical we're going to do this. So, I would assume that there's a PSA test being done by somebody that our medical plan is taking care of.

Ms. Lamberton stated in the grievance which was arbitrated the firefighters wanted the PSA test, they said it was not a complete exam unless this was included and the arbitrator agreed with them and consequently we had to go forward and start administering it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I guess my question is what is the difference between a physical that a firefighter gets and a pre-employment physical that a police officer gets?

Mr. Robidas replied there actually more involved with the firefighter than even the police officer because each one is dictated by their own industry or national standards. Firefighters, as an example, they have OSHA, they have the National Fire Protection Association which lays things out where the police officers are guided by the state regulations on the Police Standards and Training Council...they dictate what's required. Additionally, for police officers all we're required to do under the police officers under the statutes is give them the entry level...whereas a firefighter we're required to come back with annual physicals. So, again, there's substantial difference in costs because police officers...we are in essence only on the hook if you will at a pre-employment stage.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked Ginny is there a reason why some of these costs can't be passed onto the medical?

Ms. Lamberton replied if according to the health insurance plan if an employee goes to the bathroom and says I need a physical exam for work it isn't payable under our health insurance plan.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated random drug tests...do we pay for those if they've failed?

Mr. Robidas replied yes we pay for all the random drug tests.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how many drug tests have been done that have been done that have been failed by employees?

Ms. Lamberton replied oh, a lot.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how many?

Mr. Robidas stated we have two different pools. Some are required...the firefighters are not required under the Department of Transportation, they're exempt under the federal regulations but it's included as part of their collective bargaining agreement that they begin a drug testing program of about two years ago. They're actually kept in a separate pool from the other city drivers because we cannot contaminate the pool...you have a DOT and a non-DOT pool. Our DOT pool we were up to approximately 7% of our people that tested positive and we've had positive tests as well in the firefighter pool.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated give me numbers, percentages don't do me any good.

Ms. Lamberton stated we'll get you those numbers.

Mr. Robidas stated the numbers are high because some people no longer remain in our employment after a period of time because some have gone back and failed a second time and most department heads at that point dismiss these people. So, it's hard to get an exact number but it's not uncommon that we were up probably 8 or 9 positives.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the two physicians that we have at the Health Department are they capable of giving these physicals?

Mr. Robidas replied one of the physicians that's at the Health Department actually serves on the committee and she's not a certified occupational physician which is what we required in our bid specs.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's try that question again.

Ms. Lamberton replied no is the answer...they're pediatricians. These are board certified occupational physicians.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so the answer to the question is the people sitting there in the Health Department can't do it.

Both Ms. Lamberton and Mr. Robidas replied that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if I were to go out and hire a doctor that was qualified to do it there would be an added revenue and then also I would believe that it's not going to take him 365 days to do 231 physicals.

Ms. Lamberton stated we're not the only customers or Elliot Hospital and we don't have all of the equipment and the laboratories and all the other stuff that they have access to.

Alderman O'Neil stated we could spend all night on this discussion...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected no we can't only another 10 minutes.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you but we as the City...I'm not going to pass blame did not implement the Wellness Program, it was negotiated, we've spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for...was not implemented properly and because of it it's cost us at least \$100,000 that we're seeing here if not more. I'm in receipt of a letter from a family physician in this city who is asking why he has to perform tests on young firefighters that are not appropriate for their age group. This whole thing is out-of-control and somehow we've got to reel it back in whether we utilize the Health Department whether they're pediatricians or not utilize them to at least help advise us in the right direction. I understand there's conflicts between this contract doctor and personal physicians of the firefighters that has cost us considerable amount of money...it out-of-control and I think it needs to be addressed at our level.

Alderman Roy stated the costs that you have for medical expenditures on this sheet is there a way to pass these through and put them in the actual departmental line items department budgets. You're line items get a little skewed or the size of your department gets a little skewed because you're picking up like Information Systems postage...there are things that you're not directly responsible for but in your line item.

Ms. Lamberton stated you can put it here in a centralized fund or you can decentralize it but right now it's not going to change the price.

Alderman Roy asked do you think it would help the department heads manage their department's better if they saw these costs. The Fire Department seems to be the biggest number...when you categorize all other departments.

Ms. Lamberton stated it's not much like a new employee physical...the turnover rate for the City in general is really low and so I don't think it has any impact. Could we eliminate the new employee physicals. I think for the most part we probably could.

Alderman Roy asked what liability would that open us up to.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think Harry Ntapalis would tell you something about I think it's called the second fund for worker's comp or something...Second Injury Fund, thank you. If we've done the physicals we have access to that fund for a big comp claim. If we haven't we can't go to that fund and that has helped the City.

Alderman Roy stated I think that number is significant. Okay, I for one hate when we pass through to departments other costs, so I would look to see if sometime in the future...maybe not with this budget but in the future...we could move some of this testing. I know there's other wellness line items in the Fire Department budget it would be nice to see this attached to it so it could be managed and monitored.

Alderman Long stated I noticed the new contract expires this spring...at the bottom subject to new contract awards in Spring of '06...what is that.

Ms. Lamberton asked is this on the medical sheet?

Alderman Long replied on the price based on city contracts.

Ms. Lamberton stated because of the arbitration decision...in contracts sometimes you can renew the contract as long as the same services are going to be provided and negotiate new numbers or not.

Alderman Long stated this isn't the medical contract.

Ms. Lamberton stated it is the medical contract and because of the grievance and the arbitration decision the level of services has changed and that's why Red and one of the physicians from the Health Department and a few other employees of the City are working on the new RFP so now we have a 30-day by 30-day extension until such time as the bid is awarded to someone else.

Alderman Long asked is Anthem in on this RFP by any chance?

Ms. Lamberton replied no.

Alderman Long asked do they have a division that may test this?

Mr. Robidas stated we actually sent out approximately six RFP's to the initial contract...there were two vendors who actually responded and we went through an interview process and we received financial documentation from them which we sent to the Finance Department to review so we have two vendors that responded.

Alderman Long asked was one of them a national company?

Mr. Robidas replied no neither one are a national company.

Ms. Lamberton stated for the alcohol and drug testing?

Alderman Long stated for any of these.

Mr. Robidas stated I was just contacted in the past week or so by a national company that wants to be included in the bid process that provides mobile services.

Alderman Long asked are they competitive?

Mr. Robidas stated we'll find out.

Alderman Long asked any rough ideas as to what their numbers would be comparable to these?

Mr. Robidas replied no. All they did was send the background material on their company to make sure they were included in the bid process. Generally, when we send it out we include Catholic Medical Center, Dartmouth...those places are automatically receiving them as well.

Alderman Long asked was there any look at as Alderman Gatsas mentioned... some of these that are already covered in the regular health plan?

Ms. Lamberton replied if an employee goes to a doctor and divulge the fact that he or she is getting a test for her employer it will be paid. If they tell them that then it is not paid.

Alderman Long asked in our health care do we get...the employees health care...do they get an annual physical.

Ms. Lamberton stated you can have an annual physical.

Alderman Long stated one of these was an annual physical whether it's for employment or not.

Ms. Lamberton stated under the health plan yes but it's not going to be as comprehensive as some of these.

Mr. Robidas stated and it won't meet the criteria they are required to follow.

Alderman Smith stated I noticed the exams for firefighters and police officers are required by state law. Does state law have any minimum requirements, do they specify what constitutes a physical exam or what?

Mr. Robidas replied yes they do. They actually have sheets that are in control of our physician and they actually complete the forms and file the forms with either the Fire Standards or the Police Standards on behalf of the candidate. There are very specific criteria that they are required to exam.

Alderman Roy stated just to clarify where Alderman Long was going. It's my understanding that a firefighter that works for the City of Manchester sees his regular doctor for an annual physical on a Monday, gets that annual physical, runs through whatever that doctor determines to be appropriate, comes out with a clean bill of health...under the arbitration ruling they are still required to even if it's the following day to go to the Elliot Hospital and have another full physical with all tests deemed appropriate by the arbitration's decision..

Mr. Robidas stated right because part of the standards specify specifically what type of physician should be performing those.

Alderman Roy stated so even if you wanted to ask employees or employee's offered to have their physical under the yearly plan we still could not do that under the decision that came down.

Mr. Robidas replied that's correct because we have an occupational physician.

Alderman Roy stated okay I wanted to make sure that everyone understood that and that also falls into the fact that employees don't have a choice of where they go for their physical so some are seeing their regular doctor and some are seeing the wellness.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated you're getting a disagreement from the Chief Negotiator back there so why don't we just leave that alone and not go down that road because one person shouldn't be talking about a contract negotiated item that maybe you don't understand. I'm not saying that you don't but there's a shaking of a head back there.

Mr. Robidas stated I can only relate to this, he does the contracts.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think before any RFP goes out and gets awarded it should come back to this full Board. I agree with some of the bullet points in here. Most of this has nothing to do with NIOSH because NIOSH is a report on a firefighters fatality and there were certain recommendations but that's not what was negotiated. What was negotiated was a Wellness Program that was developed by the International Fire Chiefs with the International Firefighters. So, we need to make sure that we're all talking the same thing and again this thing the only reason it went to arbitration is because we screwed it up on our end that's why it went to arbitration and we lost. So, let's get over the baloney here and let's get this back in line on where it should be. We had too many hands in the pie on this thing that's why we lost.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's do this. If we take your number of \$1,055,059 and subtract from that \$232,000 bring you to \$823,059...that \$232,000 obviously we will have a discussion about is \$164,000 for wages for the Chief Negotiator and the Security person, \$54,000 in benefits and \$14,000 in FICA. So, I leave that on the side and say that \$823,059 is the number we're dealing with and I think that those two people are not only significant to the City but they're significant to every department in the City including the Enterprise funds of EPD and Water and Airport and the rest of them and School, so I think that maybe those can be a chargeback item that we might be able to recoup some of those revenues. So, that's the number \$823,059 and we'll leave in abeyance the \$232,000 number.

Alderman Roy stated, Mr. Chairman, just so I'm somewhat on the same page as you if we go ahead and chargeback their salaries then all we have to do is to bill their salaries into other department line items am I to understand that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Enterprise funds you won't see them that's maybe where there's a chargeback ability for us.

Alderman Roy stated other departments...their salaries would be built into the budget and other places.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated not necessarily, they be built in here with a revenue also coming back here as a chargeback.

Mayor Guinta stated before this Board makes a decision on that I would only ask that it have some sort of answer from the Enterprise as to whether an agreement can be reached.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I don't disagree with you, your Honor, I'm just making sure we just lay it on the side in abeyance.

Alderman Lopez stated in either case we're going to have a Chief Negotiator...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected that's not necessarily true.

Alderman Lopez stated and a Security Manager.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas reiterated that's not necessarily true.

Alderman Lopez stated well in my opinion anyway.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that's your opinion and you're one of 15 that have an opportunity...

Alderman Lopez stated I would hope that there would be 10 other people on this Board who agree with me. I think to create a budget on an unknown is not a factor, in my book. I'd rather see the position there and if they can work on getting the chargeback back from other departments or the Enterprise systems that's one thing but to predicate that this is going to happen I think we have to make a decision for the department head to put those two positions and to put it in her budget which she had but the number that I like is the one that she presented with the Chief Negotiator and the Security Manager and then if you want to chargeback later on that would be added revenue coming in and if you want to do that then I think there needs to be some discussion about that before we walk away tonight assuming that they are eliminated provided they are going to be charged back to the departments and I think Alderman Roy is absolutely correct. They're going to add money to their departments...like robbing Peter to pay Paul...that doesn't make sense to me. I like the number she presented. You've got to remember one other thing, one other comment. This is one department in this City since I've been here that has lost people in their department and they've picked up every job under the department head...she lost a deputy...I'll let her speak for herself.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's understand something. I think Ginny Lamberton does a great job but let's not start putting words in my mouth, Alderman. You have a piece of yellow paper, you have the ability to use whatever number you want.

Alderman Lopez stated and I am using her number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated then you use whatever number you want, you have a budget that you're constructing that's fine. We as the Board are working through this process. We'll have the ability to do what we want with the votes that we have.

Alderman Lopez stated well let's take a vote right now.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked do you want to vote on things as we go through the whole night? If that's what you're looking to do we can do that.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it's too important for a Chief Negotiator and the Security Manager not to know at this stage of the game and the department head not to know whether she's going to lose those two positions because who's going to pick up those positions. You talk about the department head is going to do this and people are going to do this and volunteers are going to do this...it's not going to happen.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated you just used the word volunteer...do you have people volunteering for this job. Red, are you volunteering. Okay, I was just checking because I didn't know if Alderman Lopez suggested that you were going to volunteer.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I didn't hear it from the Mayor I heard it from Alderman Lopez. Okay, let's go.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **Health**

Mr. Fred Ruscsek, Public Health Officer, stated first I'd like to respond to a question from you from the last time I wasn't able to and your question was how did salaries go up in public health by five percent (5%) with all of the turnover and the fact of the matter is when you look at '06 when we backed out the School cost for '06...I backed out too much money, I backed out about \$20,000 that is offset by School revenue that's in the new budget but you're absolutely correct that the increase wasn't what was reflected. The "yellow sheet" budget has us cut about

\$10,000 out of our expenses in the areas of Staff Development where we don't have a great history because that got moved into the Health Department just last year and we'll certainly try to do our best with that. Other Services when compared to past years has gone up because it's the Other Services account that we use for translation for our department and the Maintenance and Repairs we will do our best to work within that number so we will...as I indicated in the "yellow sheet" response we'll do our very best to work within the fiscal year '07. The Staff Development costs are a contractual item that we don't really have a good feel for how they'll track over a period of time because we don't have the history. The other services we don't know what we'll have coming in from clients and new residents to Manchester who will require translation services. So, we'll do our best to live within the budget that's on the "yellow sheet".

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me just make sure that our numbers are correct here. Basically, the difference between the Mayor's recommended and what the "yellow sheet" says is the difference of adding in the School Nurses back in as a given on one side versus the other, is that correct?

Mr. Rusczek replied that's correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated along with their benefits and expenses.

Mr. Rusczek stated right.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so that number...if I took the \$1,955,375 and I added to is \$1,613,186...that number is \$3,568,561...that's what the Mayor's number would appear to be.

Mr. Rusczek stated I think to that number...the number that we left with was for \$1,890,758 plus the Rines Center costs of \$139,961 and then the School expense number \$1,613,186.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated what's I'm trying to do is go back to the Mayor's budget. If you take a look at the Mayor's budget...his number starts at \$1,955,375...his total budget line item and if you notice the School District is empty for nurses...the salaries...that expense line item is \$1,613,186...do you agree with that?

Mr. Rusczek replied I agree.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so if I added that \$1,613,186 to the \$1,955,375 I'm going to come up in the Mayor's line item of \$3,568,561.

Mr. Rusczek stated okay.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I'm just trying to see what the differences are between where we are and where the Mayor was.

Mr. Rusczek stated I think the difference is reflected...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected there's about \$75,344 is what the difference is. Now, the difference in revenue...you're showing me a revenue line that's \$375,000 and the revenue side on the Mayor's budget is \$375,000 and on our side it's \$2,243,250...that difference being the revenue of chargebacks on the School side.

Mr. Rusczek stated correct plus the "yellow sheet" budget includes the increased permit fees.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the other \$20,000. So, in essence, the difference from where the "yellow sheet" is from where the Mayor is is about \$50,000 difference...from revenues and expenditures...roughly \$55,000 maybe.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm with you with the \$3,568,561...an approximate difference of \$75,000.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied \$344,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated you lost me on where that is.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated when we were working with the Health Department we increased their revenue by about \$20,000 over and above what they had on their sheet from added fees.

Alderman O'Neil stated and that's not reflected in that number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it is reflected in our side.

Alderman O'Neil stated but it's not reflected in the Mayor's number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it's reflected in the Mayor's number...what we're seeing on the subtotal revenue side of \$1,655,303...that number is greater than what we're receiving from Schools by about \$42,000...there's an additional \$22,000 on the revenue side than where the Mayor is...yes, no...hear what I'm saying.

Alderman O'Neil replied no I don't to be honest with you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the total expense for Schools is \$1,613,186. If you subtract that from the subtotal of revenue, which is \$1,655,303 that's a difference of about \$42,000. If you notice the Mayor's number is \$20,000...so we increased revenues by \$22,000 when the last time Fred came in.

Mr. Rusczek stated the difference in the School revenue there is for what would have been a stranded cost if the School Nurses moved out...a stranded cost would have been a half-time clerical person. So, by bringing the School Nurses back in that is there for reimbursement again. So, that's the difference in the School revenue side.

Alderman Roy stated Fred going up to you public health line item. When we sent you away you were given the number of \$1,890,758...do you remember what you built into that as far as the employees or changes from your departmental request?

Mr. Rusczek replied from...\$1,890,785...essentially the Mayor's Office funded our full complement and at that time it included a deputy. We backed out the \$40,000 that will be the savings from the reorganization. The Mayor's number also looked at the across the board staff attrition. But, we didn't add any people back in or take anybody out.

Alderman Roy stated so the \$1.89 and the "yellow sheet" number you were given that includes the 4% being built back in.

Mr. Rusczek stated correct.

Alderman Roy stated because that was the number we sent you away with.

Mr. Rusczek stated yes.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that was the number you left with when we gave you that number that's what you started with. So, the 4% management number is a number that's able to be talked about.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure I'm clear...are you saying you can walk with that 4% attrition number?

Mr. Rusczek replied the 4% attrition number isn't in the "yellow sheet" budget because we already backed out \$40,000 that we're going to make up through the reorganization.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are there any questions.

Alderman Lopez asked the final number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied you have one, you don't want mine.

Alderman Lopez replied sure I want yours.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated give me yours...you're not sharing information, Alderman. It's time for you to start sharing with the rest of your colleagues out here.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm going along with some of yours and some I'm not.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated then you ought to give us yours so we all at least participate...

Alderman O'Neil stated so we have a number...Fred, before you leave...there's a number that we can work with...\$3,643,905...okay, that's better than the \$3.568 you came up with earlier.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I just added that to the Mayor's number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed the **Board of Assessors**

Mr. Cornell stated thank you for this opportunity to address you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected can I just start...what did we send you away with the last time?

Mr. Cornell replied we've essentially said we can live within the Mayor's budget...we're not getting everything that we need but at the end of the day we can live within the Mayor's budget.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are there any questions. There were none.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated thank you. Do you have that number, Alderman?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed **Planning and Community Development**

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked can you live with the Mayor's budget.

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, replied just two points. One is that we were looking for \$5,000 more than the Mayor's budget and that is just simply that we have basic operating expenses from paper to copying so we were looking for \$5,000 more than the Mayor's budget. On the revenue side we are proposing after we get our third quarter results for revenues we are proposing that we could increase those revenues by \$30,000. We would have to go to the Planning Board and get their support for changing some of the site plan and subdivision fees.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what was the number that we sent you away with?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the number you sent me away with that I remember was the Mayor's budget minus \$10,750...but that was for Worker's Compensation and I think there's some confusion on the sheets as to.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the number we gave you was \$963,014...any questions on that. I have a good steno right next to me that's keep track of these. I know Alderman Lopez doesn't want to share with the rest of us so. Any questions...so the number is \$963,014. Thank you.

Alderman Roy stated, Bob, you made the comment about going to Planning Board to discuss fees. What is the likelihood of approval and when would that be able to be enacted?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the likelihood of approval is fairly good...the Planning Board has talked about changing fees but they've been busy so they haven't gotten to it but I think that could be accomplished very early on in FY07 and I would note that our fees are running ahead of schedule for this current fiscal year. So, we're doing good for FY06.

Alderman Roy stated the costs that these fees would incur to builders what do you think would be the feel in the change of affordable housing?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't think there'll be any significant impact...\$30,000 spread over perhaps \$120 million worth of construction projects is pretty minimal.

Alderman Lopez asked are you going to lose anybody under this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we will be shy just for our current staff about \$20,000. So, we are going to monitor the situation through the year and see if someone resigns or retires and if not we would probably come back to the Board to see if you would grant us that money out of Salary Adjustment.

Alderman Shea asked where are we going with the Master Plan, Bob, that's very essential, very important...just briefly I know you don't want to take up much time but it's long overdue.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes. We are actually in the process. There's a Steering Committee of Planning Board members. There's going to be a first...what I call a focus meeting of community members and you'll be getting notices that that is scheduled for June 20th. So, the Steering Committee of the Planning Board has actually been working on it for about four months. We have an 18-month (roughly) goal.

Alderman Shea asked do you have any money in the budget for that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there's a little bit of money in both the FY06 and FY07 CIP's to do the Master Plan.

Alderman Shea asked how much is that little money?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is \$40,000 I believe it is in FY06 and \$50,000 in '07 and again I'm hoping to complete the Master Plan by then.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are there any other questions. There were none.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed the **Library**

Ms. Denise van Zanten, Deputy Library Director/Interim Library Director, stated good evening.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what was the number we started you off with when you left the last time?

Ms. van Zanten replied when I left the last time is was \$2,820,715.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated again please.

Ms. van Zanten stated \$2,820,715.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated a couple of quick questions. Right now, you have a Director's position that's vacant.

Ms. van Zanten replied it's not vacant yet, he's on paid leave.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and you're the Assistant Director.

Ms. van Zanten stated correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked who has the ability to fill that position...this Board or the Trustees? When do you plan on filling the position?

Mr. Kevin Devine, Library Trustee, replied we were instructed by the Personnel Department to wait the pay out of the former Director's complete salary and accrued vacation and benefits which would mean technically we'd begin interviewing this summer for a position to be filled around October 1st.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I guess I'll ask the obvious question...it was recommended that you wait and I guess what I'd be looking for is some sort of reorganization because just from what I've seen and I certainly don't want to take a position of a trustee but I would think that you would probably have somebody that's capable of filling that position now and if you did a reorganization to fill that position and left the Assistant Director vacant that may be an accomplishment on this line item that we can get to where we need to get to.

Mr. Devine stated it would be convenient but it's not how the Trustees have done this in the past. In fact, the Trustees have a long history of doing nationwide searches for new Library Director's...we have the largest Library in the state, a very proud tradition and we intend to do a nationwide search again. Denise van Zanten has been excellent filling in in these difficult times, she's done a great job as many of you have commented on but we need to follow proper procedures. At the end of that procedure you may be right sitting to my right may well be the next Library Director but she should only get that and her co-employees would only respect that properly if she got that at the conclusion of a standard nationwide search.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Attorney Devine let me just tell you what I think about nationwide searches when sometime we have the most capable people right within our midst. We do nationwide searches for people and sometimes we find that they stay for a very short time as some communities in the state have seen with superintendents and some communities have seen with presidents of universities. So, I would think that maybe as sometimes home grown is not so bad

and it's pretty good to see a face walking in that somebody recognizes. So, when we talk about national searches that kind of...at my point...rubs me the wrong way because I think the City of Manchester and the State of New Hampshire has an awful lot of good qualified people probably more so than some other states that we may be bringing somebody in. So, that's only my opinion and I know I'm not a Trustee but I'm voicing it.

Mr. Devine stated we appreciate your input.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would ask for the Chairman of the Board of Trustees... is it something you'd be willing to look at before you made a final decision?

Mr. Devine replied first of all I'm not the Chair of the Trustees...I'm the Chair Designate...Joan Barrett is the current Chair of the Trustees...what's the question, Alderman O'Neil?

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess Alderman Gatsas' point about and this is not an unusual occurrence in city government we've been through it recently on a reorganization that just happened in the last couple of weeks with the Traffic Department and the creation of a Parking Enterprise system...I'm trying to think...somebody help me out here...the Health Department just went through a reorganization to save a deputy director and was able to reorganize and provide in what they believe is still maintaining the quality level of service...they actually promoted a couple upper level people and not fill the deputy director's position and with a savings of...I think Mr. Rusczek said earlier of about \$40,000. So, I guess I would somewhat echo what Alderman Gatsas said to strongly encourage the Trustees to look at in-house. We've had great success in other departments in the City of promoting from within and it will save a lot of time and energy and would certainly encourage if there's a way and this is not a request exclusive to the Library but to take a look at some reorganization if there might be some ways of taking...certainly respect the fact that the Trustees have the final say in this whole thing.

Mr. Devine stated let me assure you and every member of this Board that the Library Trustees are always looking at reorganization of ideas. In fact, it was less than a year ago that we began discussing that but simultaneously we had the leaving of our current Director. It was at the senior staff level that they approached the Trustees and suggested to us that further reorganization plans should await pending a new Director because a new Director should be intimately involved and hands on in the reorganization as opposed to coming in and having inherited a reorg plan that he or she had no input in...that's not really good management so senior staff asked us to await a new Director to do further

reorganization, we are trying to honor that. I understand what you're saying here but it is the confluence of budget time coming at the exact same time we're in the midst of a turnover and we'll do everything we can to cooperate.

Alderman O'Neil stated I appreciate those comments and I think you're absolutely right...the timing...kind of bringing this to a head from both sides, so I appreciate that. Thank you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked so is your suggestion that we leave all of the vacancies open until we hire somebody because that would be the proper thing to do.

Mr. Devine stated that is not our suggestion, Alderman.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked how do you do a reorg with a new Director coming in filling positions...I would think we'd wait until a new Director came in and leave this in the Salary Adjustment account and deal with it that way because that's just what you just told me.

Mr. Devine stated no it's not, Alderman. The positions that we've asked for here are positions that we've had for 20 plus years. We're asking to fill currently vacant positions. We have as requested by the Mayor looked at those we could reduce, what's before you on the "yellow sheet" is a reduction of two and the Mayor's requested four. I think we've come here in good faith, doing our best to work with this Board, we're trying very hard but we'd ask for you to respect our jurisdiction as well.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated there's no disrespect it's just from a comment that you came with. You said that the new Director should be involved in reorganization and if there are four positions open then we should wait until he comes to fill those positions.

Mr. Devine stated the Library cannot survive with those four positions open until October, Aldermen.

Mayor Guinta stated so if we fill the four positions and the complement is back up to a full complement...the current complement meets the full complement how do we anticipate a reorganization to occur by the new Director, it wouldn't be a reduction in force.

Mr. Devine stated, Mr. Mayor, what I just said and what the “yellow sheet” shows you is in fact we’ve asked to fill two of the four vacancies.

Mayor Guinta interjected you can do that without the Director but the other two you have to have...there is a double standard here. What you’re saying...you’re trying to compromise but you need the positions now but then the Director will do a reorganization...what I’m hearing from this Board is they’re trying to find a middle ground between numbers. I’m not necessarily convinced there is a middle ground. So, you may have convinced some people on this Board but you haven’t convinced me. So, I think there needs to be a serious movement to listen to what the Board is saying about the top position and I think this Board respects the fact that there is a Board of Trustees and there is a job that the Trustees should do and that there is a service, a wonderful service that’s performed by the Library. But, it doesn’t make sense to me to say that you can live without two positions but demand that a reorganization has to wait until a new Director comes into place which won’t be coming into the Library until at the earliest of this year or would it be next year?

Mr. Devine replied October of ’06.

Ms. van Zanten stated part of it was the Trustees promoted me to Deputy Director out of technical services to reflect the responsibilities I was taking over as Interim Director. If we had left me as head of technical services and left the Deputy Director position we wouldn’t be having this conversation. So, you could just demote me back to head of technical services and phase the Deputy Director position not that I want a demotion but that’s basically what happened is they promoted me to give me the salary increase so that as Deputy I run the Library and absent for the Director and that’s where that came from. So, that’s part of the situation.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked is there a way that we can leave her at her salary, allow her to be Acting Director and put her in the position that she was in, eliminate the Deputy Director’s position until you do your reorganization with a hire outside? I’m not looking to cut somebody’s salary that’s doing a job.

Mr. Devine stated in essence, Alderman Gatsas that is what we have done. We have done a minor reorganization by elevating her to the Deputy Director and naming her Acting Interim Director recognizing that with a new Director coming in there may be...as I would see reorganization a horrible elimination of the Deputy Director position in which case we will make sure that she stays on as head of technical services or the new Director depending on what the vote of the entire Trustees is.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated why don't we do this then. Why don't we look at eliminating...what was your position before?

Ms. van Zanten replied we already promoted somebody into that position. We are trying to keep things moving...so, the cataloguing position that is vacant was the position that belonged to the new head of technical services and then my old job as the head of technical services. There were two people bumped up there.

Mr. Devine stated we had to reshuffle very quickly...we lost the Director and Deputy Director very quickly together.

Ms. van Zanten stated within two months of each other.

Alderman O'Neil stated let me see if I can...and I'm working off the "yellow sheet". The suggestion is that the Administrative Assistant III is currently vacant and that the Reference Librarian position was that one that was on paper for years but there was never anyone...so it removes those two positions. You have taken the Cataloguer position and that person has been promoted to the Technical Director, am I correct?

Ms. van Zanten replied correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated the "yellow sheet" reflects filling the Cataloguer position.

Ms. van Zanten replied correct.

Mayor Guinta asked does it reflect the Deputy?

Ms. van Zanten replied no I'm in it.

Mayor Guinta stated the "yellow sheet" does not include a salary for the Deputy and the Director.

Ms. van Zanten stated yes it does.

Alderman O'Neil stated so I think it gets if I recall a full-time position with I'll say 39 and it reflects 37 then.

Ms. van Zanten stated the Cataloguer position was \$35,000 in Salary and \$20,000 for Benefits.

Alderman O'Neil stated I was talking total complement. As I recall it was 39 full-time.

Ms. van Zanten stated it's 38 full-time and 12 part-time.

Alderman O'Neil asked what does the "yellow sheet" reflect...38 full-timers?

Ms. van Zanten replied no...I'm sorry, it reflects 37.

Alderman O'Neil stated if you take the 39, get rid of the Reference Librarian that has been vacant for years, 38 and then the Administrative Assistant gets it down to 37. So, the Mayor's recommendation was 35 so we're off two positions. I noticed that you included and I don't want to beat this one because I think we talked about it last time. You've included the Security positions in your budget, does the staff or the Trustees have a position on where they're funded as long as they're funded.

Ms. van Zanten replied no.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if there's only a difference of two positions from the Mayor's budget, your budget...that's \$130,000...you look at the numbers on the "yellow sheet"...he's at \$1.550 and you're at \$1.681...I don't think those two positions that you eliminated.

Ms. van Zanten stated my budget doesn't include the 4% back out I realize that...the Mayor's attrition is not included. This is the actual number for the people currently employ at the Library including hiring the new Director and the new Cataloguer. My number without Security I can give you those salary numbers because I did another calculation just to have that for tonight if that would help, Alderman Gatsas.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no but the Security people I don't have a problem with. I'm talking about the two numbers at the top because there's a \$150,000 difference. Those two positions that are currently...you filled two and you have two empty. How much as the two that are empty?

Ms. van Zanten replied the Administrative Assistant III was budgeted at about \$35,000 in Salary and \$20,000 in Benefits so that's about \$55,000 and change and then the Reference Librarian that no longer exists is the same salary.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked which is how much?

Ms. van Zanten replied \$35,000 and \$20,000. They just happen to be at the same pay grade.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so that's at \$110,000, okay.

Alderman O'Neil stated so if I can help you, Alderman Gatsas, does that mean we're talking about \$40,000 in difference then.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think it's \$20,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'll stop trying to help you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if I deducted the difference the \$40,000 from your number of \$2,820,715 that would bring you down to \$2,780,715.

Ms. van Zanten stated so the number you gave me...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas reiterated \$2,820, 715 less \$40,000 brings you down to \$2,780,715 which is a difference of about \$110,000 from where the Mayor's is.

Mr. Devine asked what does the \$40,000 represent?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied that represents the difference between the \$150,000 and where they're at for their positions...they only need \$110,000 to fill them. You need \$110,000 to fill those two positions.

Alderman O'Neil stated Denise in your Salary did you carry the Administrative Assistant III and the Reference Librarian in your \$1,681,738...are those dollars carried in there?

Ms. van Zanten replied no they're cut, I already cut them that's why I said I removed them. The complement that's currently employed including the Director and Cataloguer's position including Security. The Security salaries are about \$36,000 and change for the two that we currently have working at the Library.

Alderman O'Neil stated we're off, Mr. Chairman, a little more than we thought because she's already back those two positions out.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I understand that but what I'm looking at...there's a difference of...the Mayor removed four positions. Out of his budget of \$1.550 there are four positions removed from what you have.

Ms. van Zanten stated the Mayor's budget was a 10% cut from what we requested in FY07 and then \$52,000 for his Salary Adjustment line. So, I haven't included that in my request.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated what I'm saying is the \$40,000 that we're off in Salary Adjustment line that goes in. So, the number that you're looking at is \$2,780,715 with a Salary Adjustment line of \$40,000.

Ms. van Zanten stated so basically the Cataloguer position is in the Salary Adjustment because that's about what the Salary is is \$35,000 and change.

Alderman Roy stated I'm just having a hard time getting your math because I think we're speaking the same language but starting at two different points. The Mayor's number of \$1.550 million subtracted from the Library's Salary line item of \$1.681 leaves you a difference of \$131,552...that number already has the two positions you're removing removed from it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's try again, Alderman, maybe I'm not being quite precise enough. The Mayor's Salary line \$1.550 million eliminates four positions.

Alderman Roy stated correct.

Ms. van Zanten stated we don't know what positions those were.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think that's...put them into Salary Adjustment or whatever they did with them. That number...if I add back your \$70,000 just in wages because the Benefit line is below that...you said \$35,000 and \$35,000...if I take the Mayor's number and use that and I add in \$70,000 I'm at \$1,620, 186.

Ms. van Zanten stated right but that doesn't include a Director or the other Reference Librarian. If you're adding back the two positions we're going to cut but not adding in the Director and the other...basically, you need about \$78,000 for the new Director and another \$35,000 for the Cataloguer.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated in the Mayor's line.

Ms. van Zanten stated I don't know what's covering the Mayor's line, it's very hard to.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I just took the Mayor's line...there's \$130,000 difference between your line and the Mayor's line. What you said a little while ago you said there were four positions that were eliminated or you had to eliminate to meet the Mayor's request, right.

Ms. van Zanten replied right we would have to cut on top...cut the three vacant positions that we have right now. Well, actually two...so we forget the Reference Librarian which I didn't realize was gone...we're still missing an Administrative Assistant and the other Librarian Cataloguer, so those two positions are gone in the Mayor's budget and to meet his number and still hire a Director we'd have to cut other full-time employees.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated two more.

Ms. van Zanten stated yes at least if not more plus part-timers as well.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so you can do that with a \$130,000 difference.

Ms. van Zanten stated I'm not getting the \$130,000 difference.

Alderman Roy stated to bring it back to where I was...the Salary line item and the Benefit line item that you put on your fiscal year '07 revised "yellow sheet" you can live with those, fill the Director's position and only fill the Cataloguer position and only leave the Administrative Assistant III and the Reference Librarian out.

Ms. van Zanten stated correct.

Alderman Roy stated delete those positions and that will give you the complement that you currently have plus a Director.

Ms. van Zanten stated yes.

Alderman Roy stated and you're comfortable with that.

Ms. van Zanten replied yes.

Alderman Roy stated I would also just urge my sentiments that as Aldermen O'Neil and Gatsas have said a reorganization may be a direction to go and I've heard nothing but wonderful things about the Interim Director.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I guess what we have is some totals that you gave us...I just got these now so maybe you can explain to me what they mean.

Ms. van Zanten stated what we did is we counted the amount of people coming through out two entranceways to the main building starting off Tuesday, as you requested, through yesterday and we had a total of 5,760 come through those two doors to use Library services in the last week.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated maybe you can explain to me the MCL Children's All Day.

Ms. van Zanten stated that's the Children's Room which is the handicap access off of Concord Street and the staff actually put these together for me...it was an all day count, it wasn't an hourly count, it was just the total at the end of the day and MCL is the main staircase that goes up the front of the building.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the Library hours are from what time to what time?

Ms. van Zanten replied on Tuesday's they're 8:30 till 5:30, Wednesday's 8:30 to 5:30, Thursday's 8:30 to 8:30, Friday and Saturday's 8:30 to 5:30 and Monday's 8:30 to 8:30.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked why do you start your week on Tuesday.

Ms. van Zanten replied I did it because you asked for this last Monday night and I wanted to give you six days. I wish we had Sunday/Monday off but we don't.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated Tuesday and Wednesday is 8:30 to 5:30, Thursday's 8:30 till 8:30 and Friday is 8:30 to 5:30 and Saturday is 8:30 to 5:30. If you change those hours on the front end of the day to 10:30 do you think the percentages of people that are coming in are between that 8:30 and 10:30 greater than they are...I would say by the looks of what this schedule looks like to me is that your biggest influx of people look like it's between 5:30 and 8:30 given on the days of Thursday's and Monday's.

Ms. van Zanten stated I wouldn't deny that being open more nights would be beneficial to the taxpayers, we would like to do that but 8:30 to 10:30 we are actually very busy in our Children's Room...that's when we do our story times and we allow the home schoolers to come in. So, we really need to be open early in the morning.

Alderman Smith asked is there any reason why you didn't include the West Side Library?

Ms. van Zanten replied I didn't think to ask them but since you asked they gave me their numbers today, they did a weekly total on Saturday and they had 751 people come through their doors last week but I don't have the daily count.

Alderman Smith asked how many employees are over at the West Side Library?

Ms. van Zanten replied the West Side has the Branch Librarian (full-time), two full-time Clerks and a Children's Librarian that splits between the main Library and the branch and a half-time Page, so we have 3.5 people working at the branch.

Alderman Smith stated I actually use the Library and they've been very good to me. Thank you.

Alderman Thibault asked does that mean that you won't have to cut any hours at all for the West Side Library.

Ms. van Zanten replied no we are not changing hours, we're good. No services will be cut with this budget.

Alderman O'Neil stated before they leave where are we with the Library budget?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked where are we, that's a good question.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Salary line item is confusing.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I was just doing that now for you.

Mayor Guinta asked do I understand that you're \$150,000 more than the recommendation that I proposed?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied right now, your Honor, I'm at...the difference between...what I've done is I've deducted that \$40,000...there's \$110,654.

Mayor Guinta stated so I essentially take that number and add it to my recommendation.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the number that the Library is walking out with today is \$2,780,715.

Alderman O'Neil stated that number reflects 37 full-time.

Ms. van Zanten asked does that include Security?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me just tell you that I think it's best if we give you a number and let you work with that because obviously you've moved some numbers in between here and you have the better qualifications of moving those numbers than I do. I don't want to tell you where to put them or where to deduct them.

Ms. van Zanten stated okay.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think that's the number when we originally started with the Library last week...we were at \$2,780,715 and I think that's where we ended up being.

Ms. van Zanten stated we're actually at \$2,820,715 when we left here last week, so we've lost. I can't do math in my head anymore I'm so tired.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated it's \$40,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated and it does for now include the \$36,000 with benefits it would be about \$42,000 for the two Security positions.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if they have them in this complement.

Alderman O'Neil stated which they do. So, if we decide to bring it into the City Clerk's...as long as they're funded...you're comfortable with that.

Ms. van Zanten stated I'm comfortable with that.

Alderman Roy asked what number did you fund the Security Guards at in your budget?

Ms. van Zanten replied I funded them at the recommendation of their current complement, which was \$36,655 for Salaries and \$6,050 for Benefits.

Alderman Shea stated they had a revised budget it was \$2,871,756.42 now that's \$91,000 less than you have \$2,780,715...I don't know why you came.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the "yellow sheet" that they left with...the number that they left here with last time was lower, they built that number up from what they left with.

Ms. van Zanten stated because I included Security. If I hadn't included Security my "yellow" budget bottom line would have been \$2,829,051...\$8,300 more. So it depends on where you put Security.

Alderman Lopez stated looking at the numbers with that cut there are you going to lose people?

Ms. van Zanten replied no I think we're going to lose our cataloguing position and that means I'll just have to outsource...I'm going to be paying a book jobber to do my cataloguing for me which means I lose a body covering a reference desk. But, no one who is currently employed will lose their jobs.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next addressed the **Office of the Mayor**

Mayor Guinta stated I have not provided a "yellow sheet" I assumed that...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas interjected well, your Honor, I wouldn't think you would because you're the '05 number and I don't know how much lower you go from that.

Mayor Guinta stated I assumed it was okay if I...I got a pretty clear indication with the exception of \$150.00 in Postage that my number was pretty good. So, we can debate the \$150.00 in Postage...if I put in half and Alderman Lopez puts in half I think we got a deal.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated thank you, your Honor. Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me understand...your budget is less than...not the '06 but the '05 number out of that department.

Mayor Guinta replied that's correct and I will do my best to live within that number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I guess when people say that you should start at home, you started at home and have gone to somebody's else home from two years ago.

Mayor Guinta stated that's true.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated thank you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas next address the **Office of the City Clerk**

City Clerk Bernier asked, Mr. Chairman, how would you like us to proceed...go through the expenses, the revenues, business licensing proposal, take questions.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me just ask you can you live with the number that you left with here the last time or do you have additional cuts?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied we didn't actually get a number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated well it looks like you have one on here.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated what we did...you had told us to take the FY06 budget, take out the three full-time and the two part-time, the staff of the Salary line and then 3% everything else down the line and that's what we did and that was the \$1.137 number that you see at the bottom of the third column.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let's start with...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we tried to show down below what each of those...you have four budget numbers in front of you and we tried to show what each of those impacts were in terms of staff and operating expenses.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas so even your request removes two Security Guards.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the current department request would be removing two Security Guards over to the Library, which was what we understood...some people were looking for a number, and it makes the rest of the department whole. I guess there's some question as to whether or not some of the staff would be transferred out later but I believe Leo...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked what is the AAIH?

City Clerk Bernier replied the Administrative Assistant III position.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated what the Mayor had removed and moved to the...as I understand it...the Finance Department for Lock Box.

City Clerk Bernier stated there are two positions he removed...one goes to purchasing which is the Legislative Assistant and the AA would go to Finance Department and the Custodian would still work in this building, City Hall Complex, but is funded out of Public Building Services.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so you never left with a number.

City Clerk Bernier replied no.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we left with instructions.

City Clerk Bernier stated what we can live with, what we're asking is that our complements be reinstated...the person would probably leave but we would like to have those positions back...that's the last column.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I thought we had a lot of time because we can work on this.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe we can get the easy part...do we agree among the department and the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen that the maintenance position is funded in the budget, do we agree on that...it's not funded in your...it's funded in the operating budget. Right now, it's currently at the Facilities Division.

City Clerk Bernier stated that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we can debate later whether it belongs in Facilities or here...I'm of the opinion it belongs in the City Clerk's budget...that's my position and I think we also can agree that there are four Security Guards in the operating budget...currently, there's two at Library and two in the City Clerk's...I'm of the opinion that the four belong in the City Clerk's with two of them supporting the Library.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there's actually isn't four in the operating budget under the Mayor's budget because it's short \$10,000. The Mayor took \$10,000 out and then split the difference between the two departments.

City Clerk Bernier stated he applied \$30,000 to the Library and returned \$30,000 to the City Clerk's Office.

Alderman O'Neil stated with this being short the \$10,000...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the number that the Library gave you was for two Security Guards is the correct number for their two Security Guards and we have built into that \$869,000 figure the two Security Guards...we actually have them broken out on a separate sheet if you want that.

City Clerk Bernier stated we had an appropriation of \$70,000...that was last year...the Mayor sent over \$30,000 to the Library and kept \$30,000 and \$10,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my question is what does the \$10,000 reflect if it's not funded somewhere...less hours of coverage?

City Clerk Bernier replied that's correct, exactly.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there any idea how many hours that might be over the year?

City Clerk Bernier replied Matthew would be able to answer that question as he deals with it but we do have Security Guards working on weekends when there's activity at the arena. As we've discovered there are problems after events (i.e., vandalism at City Hall Complex)...that's where that \$10,000 would be. If you'd like to add on, Matthew.

Mr. Matthew Normand, Deputy Clerk, stated I would just say that we delay hiring one, the fourth Security Officer to make up for that. Right now, we're on hold. The two Security Officers at the Library are working the maximum amount of hours to still make them part-time...32 hours each.

Alderman O'Neil stated so are you saying you're down a Security person.

Mr. Normand replied we're down one.

Alderman O'Neil interjected at City Hall.

Mr. Normand stated it was brought up last time. When we have the full complement we can rotate through both buildings...Library and City Hall. Right now, they're working every day at the Library so that doesn't allow us to give them a day off...they're getting a day off but it's on a Sunday when they're not open and we allow them to work a 12-hour shift.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I thought I had a handle on everything but I guess I don't have a handle on this one. So, I guess you're going to have to walk me through it because if you tried to lose me you were successful because when you say the current request is that the request you came into the Mayor with originally?

Both City Clerk Bernier and Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied no.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no, it is not, okay. The current request you have is adding all of the positions in that we heard...the two Security Guards where Alderman O'Neil was just at, okay. What you need to give me is what the wages are of those people that you just plugged in.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated okay we have that in a separate sheet here.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked is it in the packet that we received?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the sheet that is being distributed basically breaks out a lot of the positions that are in question or at least five of them. The first listed is an AAIH position which presently is vacant. We've put that salary back at what a starting position would be...that's what we built in...our current department request would be for a starting level in that position. The second is the Custodian breakout...and the third is the Legislative Assistant which is currently filled it's the person that does most of your transcribing...that's the position that's supposed to be going to Central Purchasing...that was not in our budget, we've requested that be placed back in. the next two are the current Security Guard positions that we have in our budget...no, actually, those two are the two that are at the Library...those are the Library numbers.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so those can't be added to yours.

City Clerk Bernier replied no that would be going to the Library.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the \$36,656...well, if you go out and include all of the fringe the \$42,705 is not in our current request...those are the two Library Security Guards.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the \$42,705...that's the number I'm looking at.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that's the total with benefits for the two Library Security Guards.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so I can't add that...that is not in your budget.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that's not in that \$1.3 million bottom line budget.

Alderman O'Neil stated we can take that same amount out of the Library...it's in the Library budget.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that is the same numbers that she was giving you earlier.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if you want to do that now to make life simple or if you just want...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I don't want to confuse it because we have them over there already, so let's just deal with it...

Alderman O'Neil stated currently in this fiscal year they exist in the City Clerk's budget.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated but not in the Mayor's budget.

Alderman O'Neil stated don't do...in the current fiscal year...the four Security positions exist in the City Clerk's but the Mayor moved two of them over in his proposal over to the Library.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think if we leave them in the Library right now because we've accounted for them there. If we don't have them here...if you move them right in with benefits into this line once we have a bottom line we can add to that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am with you on that, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so let's continue down...new Business License addition.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the new Business License additions were additions that we put on a separate sheet along with the revenues that we would get if we went into a different licensing program.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are they in that \$869 number.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied no. The \$869 number includes...the only thing on this sheet that that would include is the AAI position, the Custodian and the Legislative Assistant which are three positions currently in our budget, in the FY06 budget.

City Clerk Bernier stated it's part of our current complement.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is part of our current complement and we have added them in as our request because we believe that the Custodian belongs in the Clerk's Office and we believe we need those two positions to operate with particularly if we decide to take on Business Licensing we need to be fully staffed to start with. Did you want to talk about Business Licensing?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied go ahead.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we actually distributed a revised one because I didn't have my calculator...actually Alderman Gatsas had my calculator when I did the first sheet. When we used the calculator downstairs it worked better than the computer and we ended up with about \$28,000 more in revenue at the bottom-line so we gave you the revision. Basically, we're assuming in this process or what we think we can do in this process is come out with a \$75 on average. We were thinking it's going to be about 6,000 licenses to begin with. We're premising that with the idea that although at the state level I believe the Business License will be widespread...we're thinking if we go through with Committee on Administration and we talked to the Board some they're probably going to want to eliminate doctors, lawyers and some other professional businesses.

City Clerk Bernier stated there are currently 11,000 businesses in the City of Manchester. We feel that only about half of them...after we sit down and make our presentation to the Committee on Administration there will be some professional people that will not be included in Business Licensing.. So, our estimate is that we will have 6,000 businesses that we can license. We believe after we sit down and talk to the Committee that an average of \$75 would be appropriate.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated what we based...we have presently Sunday licenses and other licenses as you are aware, so what we did was we put together what we thought would be the staffing needed to carry out a new program which outlines two License Enforcement Inspectors...one we're hoping within an 18-month period we may not need that position anymore but we would need it to start with, a part-time Administrative Assistant III position and some temporary hires. The operational cost of consumable supplies...postage and printing is pretty

simple to look at; the equipment is based on what I discussed with the Information Systems Department as well as a system functionality improvements. If we're going to do Business Licensing we're going to have to improve the Business Licensing program we have, we would probably want to bring in HTE or at least set it up so that the cash receipting process can interface with HTE ultimately. In order to do that and purchase the equipment needed in the office for somebody to do data entry it is simply a computer/printer type set up. With that and the consumable supplies we're at the \$28,000 figure you see. So, we took the total revenue projected of \$450,000, we backed off \$100,000 which is what the current revenues are in Sunday licenses because we wouldn't be doing Sunday licenses under this proposal. So, the additional revenues would be \$350,000 and the additional cost actually tally \$161,733 so additional revenues to the bottom line would be \$188,267.

Alderman Roy stated the Business License...what would the cost be and what businesses would be impacted.

City Clerk Bernier replied that will be something we will need to discuss with the members of the Committee on Administration...we are planning on meeting with the Committee sometime next month to discuss that and get their feedback at which time we could then write an ordinance for the Board's review...that will be the decision of the Committee on Administration.

Alderman Roy stated what I'm trying to get at is what did you use as a fee for those 6,000 businesses that would be applicable to come up with the revenue numbers.

City Clerk Bernier asked are you talking about the cost of \$75?

Alderman Roy replied yes...is that the number you used...\$75.

City Clerk Bernier stated we tried to include what the cost would be for the computer...the actual cost of expenses, staffing, etc. to administer the licensing and we figured a fair amount was \$75. Now, again, some companies like J. C. Penny might pay a little bit more but that's something that the Committee on Administrative will have to review and decide upon. Whether we go by square footage or go by the number of employees in each business. For example, you can have a person who is shining shoes on Elm Street who will register with us and we would probably only charge him \$25 where other companies we'll charge a little bit more but it balances out to \$75...again, that is something that would need to be discussed with the Committee on Administration and get feedback from the Aldermen.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated one thing I didn't note on the License Enforcement Inspectors we actually budgeted those out at nine months because we figured we'd start one somewhere in September and one probably shortly thereafter.

Alderman O'Neil stated for clarification...this is coming out of the legislation...I don't know what the status is regarding Business Licensing at the state level but to make sure I'm clear...I don't even know if that's passed.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied it's passed.

City Clerk Bernier stated it's passed and Senator Gatsas has been instrumental in seeing to its passage. Correct me if I'm wrong...I think it's in Committee on Conference because they wanted to add the towns to it. I think it's just a procedure they have to go through and I think the towns and the cities have different RSA's...it was overwhelmingly supported by the Senate and the House.

Alderman O'Neil stated in order to carry this out we've got to have some people to do it, is that correct?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I think if you're going to generate \$450,000 I'd say he'd have to put some people in.

Alderman Garrity asked where do you plan on putting these new employees?

City Clerk Bernier replied right in the lower level of this building the room currently being used by the Assessors, however, they will be out by September so we could place those people there if need be.

Alderman Lopez stated you've got \$1,915,655 as your total revenue...I'm including what you put in there and what the Mayor put in there.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated \$1.562 million are you looking at that sheet?

Alderman Lopez stated I'm including the Mayor's revenue...

City Clerk Bernier stated you're talking \$1.727 million.

Alderman Lopez stated that's correct plus the \$188,000 more.

City Clerk Bernier stated no and that's something we need to discuss and Tricia maybe you could...for example, cable...we believe we're just going to raise \$950,000...the Mayor has \$1.050 million...because with MCAM we have to back out some money and I'll have Tricia address this item.

Ms. Patricia Piecuch, Deputy Clerk, stated what we've done is we've looked at the revised revenue numbers which is why you have those there and have increased \$35,000. We did increase the cable by \$25,000...it's all we feel comfortable doing. We have now received our third check...it was only \$3 million so when I take the three checks that we have for this year and then back out the 20% fee that we have to pay to MCAM that's where we come up with the \$950,000 because we do not know what that next check is going to be.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me understand what you're saying. This Board decided to give MCAM a percentage of that cable fee.

Ms. Piecuch stated that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so every time the cable fee goes up they get a raise.

Ms. Piecuch stated that is correct, they get 20% of the past year's funding.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated the rates are going up again...when did I just hear. Their percentage goes up so we continually give them something even though their budget may not have changed.

Ms. Piecuch stated that is correct, they get 20% of the revenues that we receive.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated but PEG Access and MCTV have a budget. So, we've kind of made them an independent contractor and never worried about the amount of money they're getting...that doesn't sound like we did a reasonable thing by what we did but maybe we can reconsider our motion because we're continually giving them a raise. When we first started what was that cable fee number? When we originally started a year ago what was that cable amount fee?

Ms. Piecuch replied I know last year the actual FY05 was \$1.158 million.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so with that number they get 20% of that.

Ms. Piecuch replied that's correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so if we deduct 20% from the \$1.050 million...about \$200,000.

Ms. Piecuch stated we just gave them...their first check was \$231,770.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that was their first check.

Ms. Piecuch stated that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked when do they get paid again?

Ms. Piecuch replied next year...I think it's in March.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated in March of next year.

Ms. Piecuch stated that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated and if that fee is calculated at higher than the \$1.058 million you give them 20% of that. I think maybe this Board ought to reconsider what they did because as fees go up and as national franchise fees come into play we have to be very careful what we did because it may not be acceptable to be able to participate that way. I'm not saying taking MCAM's money away but they should come to this Board for a budget just like we make MCTV do.

Ms. Piecuch stated if I can continue with the revenues...under the certified records fees the Mayor did increase it \$20,000 and again at looking at our revenues we don't feel that as of the beginning of May we should realize our \$214,000 this year but if this number is increased again...as a reminder the state share of vital records needs to increase another \$13,440 because we need to refund the state those monies for records received. On the Sunday licenses we did go with the...

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to go back to make sure that the revenue number here...the Mayor increased the revenue to \$1.727 million and that the \$188,000...I have \$1,915,655...now, when the revenues were given to us.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated now let me understand...you're using the Mayor's revenue number this time.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm using the Mayor's revenue number.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated this is the first time I've heard you use his number.

Alderman Lopez stated they're anticipating the money coming in there so I'll use his number and the Finance Director said his number was reasonable at that time so now we're adding the \$188,000 more because we have a new system coming in and that comes to \$1,915,655. Now, if they don't make it let the "Rainy Day" fund at the end of the season.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked have you used the Mayor's number in any of the expense items in the budget that you're building.

Alderman Lopez replied we're building on it. I'd like to get that number of revenue is \$1,915,655.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated you don't want to deduct MCAM you just think that's our revenue.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm going along with the Mayor on that one.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I can't agree with you because you were one of the ones leading the charge the loudest for MCAM to get their 20% of the revenues.

Alderman Lopez stated let me remind you, Alderman, whether I was the one leading or not it took the votes in order to do it and we did it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that's why I'm asking this Board to reconsider what their vote was because as you can see we're using a fixed number and giving them a raise.

Alderman Lopez stated Alderman you made your point if you want to reconsider, if you want to bring the contract it, you want the Board to redo it...it's a 3-year contract, the City Attorney will tell us what we can do and what we can't do. Thank you.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me ask Tom. Tom, can one Board bind another Board by contract. So, what you're saying is that we've given them a 20%...now let me ask the next question, Tom. What happens if and that's based on the Comcast Agreement. If Verizon comes in tomorrow and puts in because that's what they're working on right now...to come in and be a competitor and they pick up 50% of the revenue does that contract follow them.

City Solicitor Clark replied no. We would receive no revenue from Verizon that's where you're going, right.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no we will receive...there's the ability to receive the franchise fee but the agreement that we have with MCAM is based on Comcast.

City Solicitor Clark replied correct and I believe that's why it's restricted.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated if the revenue from Comcast goes down to \$500,000 then they only get \$100,000. I just hope that everybody understands that when we're talking about contracts.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure...you know we beat things to death sometimes and we do have a contract, it was voted on by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen...a majority and we're trying to circumvent everything and we just can't do it. If Tom says we can open us that contract and you want to reconsider then bring it in.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas asked are there any further questions. I don't have a "yellow sheet" number, Alderman, do you have one?

Alderman Lopez stated mine is \$1.387 million. I'm going with the department's request.

Mayor Guinta stated that's a \$100,000 less than their original request.

Alderman Lopez stated about \$91,000 somewhere around there.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated which is about...

Alderman Lopez stated but they're going to bring in \$188,000 more.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated which is about a 30% increase from where the Mayor is. Is that about a 30% increase? Let me just do the math I want to make sure...a 27% increase.

City Clerk Bernier stated that includes Business Licensing.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me give you my number so that we at least have a reasonable rationale that we can work with. What I've done is I've subtracted under your expense lines \$44,000 because Incidentals...I don't know what incidentals are...but \$34,000 seems like it's not an incidental item.

City Clerk Bernier stated Incidentals stated that is used to pay for legal notices and that averaged what \$18,000 last year and when we purchase a projector or any additional equipment for City Hall that is where that money comes from...flowers, etc.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the bill for the Public Hearing was \$1900 and it comes out of that account.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated so your Incidental account when I looked into 2005 in actuals was about \$60,000.

Mayor Guinta stated I think I have the breakout for the 09-05 Incidental line item in my office if you want me to try and find it.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated I have it right here if I want to open the book.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it's \$32,000.

Mayor Guinta stated from what was paid to each billable...I have that list if you...

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated let me work it this way and then we can give them a "yellow sheet" number and work from that because we all have different numbers. So, at least we know what the "yellow sheet" is going to say. I've taken the current department's request of \$1,387,955, I've deducted from that \$151,549.

Alderman O'Neil asked what was that based on?

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied that was based on the positions that were...the Legislative Assistant and the AAI...\$151,000...they have been transferred into someone else's account that funding so they're out of this budget. So, again, just like you said if we move them back in we move them back with rates. So, I subtracted that out and leaves you with \$1,236,446 and then from there I deducted \$44,000 in the workable expenses and came down to \$1,192,446 which is about \$100,000 from where the Mayor is and I have done anything with the revenue side of adding those new people in.

City Clerk Bernier stated you have not added in your number Business Licensing.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated no...my number is \$1,192,446 and obviously if we're going to account for the revenue we've got to give them people to get the revenue which would be the \$329,000 down at the bottom.

Alderman O'Neil stated put that off to the side if you can but for now the number that you just read off...their request \$1,387,995 minus the \$151,549 which is the vacant position, the Custodian and the Legislative Assistant positions and then you threw another number out.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated about \$44,000 for expenditures...Special Projects...I think we can take one year off from special projects...things like that I think that they can work it. If they come into a pinch and need additional dollars there's money in Contingency line item that if they need...we have a public hearing that's going to cost \$2,000 obviously you don't have it in the budget you come to us and there's Contingency funds.

Alderman O'Neil stated the new number then is, Mr. Chairman.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas replied \$1,192,446.

Alderman O'Neil stated so if we decide later to move the two Security Guards that are currently at the Library we would add to that.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated but we would deduct from Library.

Alderman O'Neil stated correct. If we decide to move the Custodian position from Facilities Division to Clerk we would remove from Facilities. The Legislative Assistant was going where?

City Clerk Bernier replied Central Purchasing.

Alderman O'Neil stated if we don't do Central Purchasing that will have to be added.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated that would be...again, if we don't do Central Purchasing and I guess that's a question position of whether we return it or eliminate it.

Alderman O'Neil stated the vacant Administrative Assistant III position was to go with the Lock Box Program.

Vice-Chairman Gatsas stated correct. So, all of those would be added back in.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess the only number that would be off somewhat would be the Security position(s) because to fully fund it...the Mayor recommended \$60,000 to fully fund it, the request between the two departments is \$70,000.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to get the Mayor's reaction as things go on now. Are you keeping track of what the "yellow sheets" say.

Mayor Guinta replied no. First of all, I think this is an important exercise for the Board to go through. What I would...I tried to accomplish a lot with different things during this budget process one of which is trying to recognize how to become more efficient and how to think from a creative standpoint to either be more frugal or generate more revenue. I can tell you there's one proposal I heard tonight and it was from Joan Porter that I thought was fantastic. Looking at a way to, first of all, I think she took this approach seriously. I think she looked at her budget, I think she brought a creative suggestion that requires a legislative action but one that I would support and it would generate additional income...that's the kind of approach I think, I hope that this budget process would generate and I saw it from the Tax Collector and I hope to see more of it from other department heads so do I think this process is beneficial absolutely because it's clear to me that there are department heads who want to work with this Board and it's clear to me that this Board wants to work with the department heads. So, I'm pleased but I do have to go through the numbers that we're looking at to see what the impacts are because we still have tomorrow evening...Police, Fire and Highway and we still have a discussion about Schools.

Alderman Shea stated what my question is is that there are certain differences between what your budget has recommended and what we're coming up with this evening, so you would look either favorably upon certain types of...

Mayor Guinta stated what I'm committed to doing is working with this Board to try to find I think that compromise that I think we're all trying to get to but there are certain guidelines that I feel and I hope this Board feels are necessary and one of them is to provide tax relief. So, I think it will be beneficial for us to see the changes and adjustments that have been discussed, what they actually mean from a dollar in a true tax rate or a true tax adjustment and that will give us more direction. Again, with the big three coming plus Schools it's very difficult for me to tell you whether I can support each and every one of these changes but it's a process, I would fully expect this Board to make amendments to my budget and I'm certainly still committed to working with you to try and find that middle ground.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee